



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,184	03/30/2006	Gary A. Schwartz	US030405	7437

28159 7590 10/19/2009
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001

EXAMINER

SANTOS, JOSEPH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3737

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/19/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/574,184	SCHWARTZ, GARY A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOSEPH SANTOS	3737	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/09/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims **2-8, and 10-16** are objected to because of the following informalities: these claims fail to set forth any additional structural limitations.
Appropriate corrections required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims **1-9, and 14-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seyed-Bolorforosh et al. (Seyed) (US 5,797,846).

Seyed teaches a system and method to sample a volumetric region by obtaining a high frame rate while limiting the spatial aliasing, comprising: a two dimensional array, a beamformer 2, processor 4, and a scan converter/display 8. In accordance, the ultrasound beam distribution is adjusted according to the scan format and the beam width. The beam width is proportional to the point spread function (which is the product of the F number and the operating wavelength; the F number equals the focal depth divided by the aperture). Seyed teaches a method of changing the focal depth or the aperture width to obtain an optimal minimum number of beams fired. This way, modifying the point spread function to satisfy the Nyquist spatial sampling criteria by maintaining the number of beams to the optimal minimum (col. 1 line 60 to col. 2 line 46 and Figs. 3A and 3B). Further, Seyed teaches the beam distribution can be dependent on the apodization or window shading function (col. 4 lines 29-31). In addition, Seyed teaches a scan controller which controls the beam distribution and the beam density (col. 4, lines 6-9). Seyed further teaches that the transducer array can vary each successive firing ray to obtain a steering angle which is significantly different than the steering angle of the previous firing ray (col. 5, lines 47-50), therefore providing for beam overlapping. Seyed further teaches changing the transmitted and/or received beams in the azimuth and longitudinal dimensions (Figs. 3A and 3B), and further varying the beamforming parameter of each of the firings rays to provide a change in the focus position of the ray or otherwise changing the spatial position of the received data for each firing (col. 1, lines 24-34). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art to fire two different rays with different line densities, one density less than the other, and to further overlap these rays using the scan controller and methods teach by Seyed. Further, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art that having Seyed scanned a volumetric area in azimuth and longitudinal dimension, the invention of Seyed would efficiently scan a volumetric region in both symmetrical/asymmetrical azimuth and elevation dimensions in order to provide a user desired scanning area. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled

in the art to further vary the aperture width of the transducer in order to provide a desired point spread function parameter.

4. Claims **10-13 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seyed-Bolorforosh et al. (Seyed) (US 5,797,846) in view of Ustuner et al. (6,551,246).

Seyed teaches the system as disclosed above but fails to teach the used of apodization to provide a required point spread function. Ustuner et al., in the same field of endeavor, teach that apodizations parameter associated with a pair of transmitted rays is selected such that the spatial frequency spectrum, and therefore the point-spread function have an acceptable structure (col. 15, lines 8-11). Ustuner further teach that the beam-width/side-lobe compromise through the angle of the transmit wave and the apodization parameter (col. 3, lines 12-15). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art to use the apodization to control the point spread function and therefore providing a effective spatial sampling in order to provide an ultrasound transmitting/receiving mechanism that can improve the point spread function. Finally, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art that the apodization parameter will vary based on the beam angle as taught by Ustuner et al.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSEPH SANTOS whose telephone number is 571-270-7782. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 7:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BRIAN CASLER can be reached on 571-272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3737

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J.S./
Examiner, Art Unit 3737

/Ruth S. Smith/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3737